

**Kenneth R. Davis II**, OSB No. 971132  
davisk@lanepowell.com  
**Parna A. Mehrbani**, OSB No. 053235  
mehrbanip@lanepowell.com  
**LANE POWELL PC**  
601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 2100  
Portland, Oregon 97204-3158  
Telephone: 503.778.2100  
Facsimile: 503.778.2200

**Dane H. Butswinkas** (*pro hac vice pending*)  
dbutswinkas@wc.com  
**Matthew V. Johnson** (*pro hac vice pending*)  
mjohnson@wc.com  
**WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP**  
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202.434.5000  
Facsimile: 202.434.5409

Attorneys for Defendant Fluke Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**FLIR SYSTEMS, INC.**, an Oregon  
corporation,

No. 3:10-cv-00971-HU

Plaintiff,

v.

Defendant Fluke Corporation's  
**MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE  
TO STATE A CLAIM**

**SIERRA MEDIA, INC.**, a Washington  
corporation, and **FLUKE CORPORATION**, a  
Washington corporation,

**ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

Defendants.

---

PAGE 1 - DEFENDANT FLUKE CORPORATION'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR  
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM

**LOCAL RULE 7.1 CERTIFICATION**

Counsel for Defendant Fluke Corporation (“Fluke”) conferred in good faith with counsel for Plaintiff Flir Systems, Inc. (“Flir”) prior to the filing of this Motion. The parties were unable to resolve the issues raised in this motion.

**MOTION**

Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant Fluke Corporation (“Fluke”) respectfully moves to dismiss the Complaint filed by Plaintiff Flir Systems, Inc. (“Flir”) for failure to state claims upon which relief may be granted. First, Flir has failed to state a claim for false advertising under the Lanham Act—15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(B) (Count One), because Flir failed to plead its claim with requisite particularity, it has not adequately pleaded a false or misleading statement, and it has not adequately pleaded injury. Second, Flir has not stated a claim for trade association/unfair competition under the Lanham Act—15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(A) (Count Two), because it has not alleged a protectable trademark or trade dress, because Flir has not alleged that Fluke engaged in the unapproved use of that mark or dress, and because Flir has not alleged that, as a result of the alleged unapproved use of that mark or dress, consumers are likely to confuse Fluke’s thermal imaging cameras for Flir’s. Third, Flir has failed to state claims for publication of injurious falsehoods or business disparagement (Counts Three and Four) because it does not appear that either claim is recognized under Oregon law. Furthermore, even if those claims were recognized, Flir has not properly alleged a false statement of fact, has not properly pleaded special damages, and failed properly to allege intent and malice. Fourth, Flir has failed to state a claim for civil conspiracy (Count Five) because it has not pleaded with requisite particularity, has not adequately pleaded an underlying tort, and has failed to adequately allege facts supporting the existence of a conspiratorial agreement. Fifth, Counts Eight (Injunctive Relief) and Nine (Attorneys’ Fees) should be dismissed because they are prayers for relief, rather than separate causes of action.

Finally, the Court should strike Flir's request for punitive damages and attorneys' fees, as such relief is not permitted under Oregon law for actions based on speech.

DATED: November 1, 2010.

LANE POWELL PC

By s/Parna A. Mehrbani

Kenneth R. Davis II, OSB No. 971132

Parna A. Mehrbani, OSB No. 053235

Telephone: 503.778.2100

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

Dane H. Butswinkas (*pro hac vice pending*)

Matthew V. Johnson (*pro hac vice pending*)

Attorneys for Defendant Fluke Corporation